UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
29th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 27 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIBULSONGGRAM (Thailand)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 75: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 73: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

PROGRAMME BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-57689 5441S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/46/SR.29
4 December 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 75: QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION (continued) (A/46/21; A/SPC/46/L.5-L.8)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that there would be no programme budget implications arising from the provisions of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.5 on information in service of humanity. The statement of the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6 on United Nations public information policies and activities was contained in document A/SPC/46/L.7. In view of the statement made by the representative of Costa Rica at the 9th meeting, no action was required on the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica on questions relating to information (A/SPC/46/L.8), the text of which would be reflected in the Rapporteur's report.

2. Mr. SUHAIL (Pakistan), speaking as Acting Chairman of the Committee on Information on behalf of the officers of the Committee on Information and the spokespersons of the regional groups and China, introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6. He said that he earnestly hoped that they would be adopted without a vote. The two draft resolutions were contained in the report of the Committee on Information (A/46/21), which had been adopted by the Committee on Information by consensus at its thirteenth substantive session in April. The first resolution reflected the international community's aspirations for a new world information and communication order and expressed its regard for the principles of the freedom of information and expression. The second resolution encompassed the mandate provided by the Committee on Information for public information policies and activities.

3. The adoption of those resolutions by consensus in the Committee on Information had been preceded by detailed consultations and negotiations between the officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China. Subsequently, when the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/SPC/46/L.7 had been submitted to the Special Political Committee, the Chairman of the Committee on Information had made a statement, on 25 October 1991, informing the Special Political Committee that the statement of programme budget implications in respect of paragraph 1 (l) and (m) of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6 did not correspond to the understanding reached in the Committee on Information between the officers of the Committee on Information and the spokespersons representing the regional groups and China. They had believed and expected that that understanding would be reflected in the statement of programme budget implications, and that that had been so understood by the Department of Public Information. Regrettably, that had not proved to be the case.

4. He wished to underline the importance of those understandings, which had been reached after extensive negotiations and necessary compromises. It was, indeed, possible that misunderstandings and confusions might arise from time to time. Having been conscious of such a possibility and with a view to improving and maintaining better communication and understanding, the

(Mr. Suhail, Pakistan)

Committee on Information had recommended that the officers of the Committee on Information, together with representatives of each regional group and China, in close contact with members of the Committee on Information, should meet as required and consult at periodic intervals with the Department of Public Information. In that regard, since the Committee on Information had made that recommendation, the officers of the Committee on Information and the spokespersons of the regional groups and China had held a number of valuable meetings with officials of the Department of Public Information.

5. However, despite the availability of such a mechanism, the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/SPC/46/L.7 did not accord with the understanding reached, as pointed out by the Chairman of the Committee on Information in his statement. In spite of the Chairman's request, it had not been possible to issue a revised statement of programme budget implications by the Controller for the reasons cited in his letter dated 14 November 1991 (A/SPC/46/4).

6. The officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China had given considerable thought to the matter. They had reaffirmed the commitment of the Committee on Information to the substance of draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 and their determination to preserve the consensus which had been achieved following arduous efforts.

7. There seemed to be no alternative before the officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China but to propose that the Special Political Committee should request the Fifth Committee to reallocate elements of section 31, relating to public information, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. In making that recommendation, they had sought reallocations only in areas that did not in any way affect policies or decisions adopted by the members of the Committee on Information and that were entirely compatible with the mandate contained in draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6. The proposed reallocations to cover the cost of implementing paragraph 1 (l) and (m) of the draft resolution related to items that in their judgement would not affect the proper functioning of the Department. The recommended reallocations involved a transfer of the stated amounts from the designated section 31 budget items to meet the costs of implementing paragraph 1 (l) and (m). In addition to not involving any policy areas, practically all the recommended reallocations were sought from budget areas where the increases requested by the Department of Public Information had been greater than the amounts being proposed for reallocations.

8. The recommended reallocations were the following: (a) in paragraphs 31.35, 31.37 and 31.38, in relation to United Nations public opinion polls and surveys, $145,000 to be reallocated from the total of $161,400, with the remainder to meet contractual requirements; (b) in paragraph 31.48, in relation to external expertise for the research, writing and design of certain information materials, $50,000 to be reallocated from the estimated total requirement of $222,400; (c) in paragraph 31.53, in relation to public information production covering production of videos for

(Mr. Suhail, Pakistan)

video-kits, etc., $50,000 to be reallocated from the estimated total of $410,500; (d) in paragraph 31.66, in relation to cost of supplies such as raw film stock, etc., $40,000 to be reallocated from the estimated requirement of $941,600; (e) in paragraph 31.67, in relation to new public information equipment, $250,000 to be reallocated from the estimated cost of $1,634,900; (f) in paragraph 31.72, in relation to public information production of additional film and video prints, $50,000 to be reallocated from the estimated total of $297,100; (g) in paragraph 31.73, in relation to pouch and special courier services to disseminate information, $100,000 to be reallocated from the estimated total of $872,900; (h) in paragraph 31.112, in relation to overtime for drivers, $35,000 to be reallocated from the estimated total of $109,800; (i) in paragraph 31.116, in relation to information centre vehicles and other equipment, $30,000 to be reallocated from the total of $727,400; and (j) in paragraph 31.118, in relation to hospitality, $20,000 to be reallocated from the total of $171,600. The recommended reallocations would involve a total amount of $770,000.

9. The officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China recognized and accepted that the recommendation contained no precedent whatsoever. That step, however, allowed the Special Political Committee to act now on draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 and to adopt them by consensus. It asserted firmly and clearly a principle of importance: that recommendations and decisions, and the understandings on which they rested, of a committee established by the General Assembly must be respected. It could not be otherwise.

10. The officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China requested the Special Political Committee to endorse the proposals for financial reallocations just outlined and to include them together with the draft resolutions in its report to the General Assembly to be taken up by the Fifth Committee. In that decision, it was understood that the Controller was free to propose - where that was judged to be of particular importance - alternative reallocations, provided no implications were involved regarding any policy decisions and recommendations as contained in draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6. He would like to request that the statement he had just made on behalf of the officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China should be fully reflected in the report of the Special Political Committee on the item.

11. He wished to state, in conclusion, the determination of the officers of the Committee on Information, the spokespersons of the regional groups and China to work in close harmony with the Department of Public Information in serving the interests of the Department, the United Nations and all Member States. Significant progress had been made in the work of advancing knowledge of the United Nations and its activities. That task remained, for all concerned, a continuing challenge for the future.

12. He called upon the Special Political Committee to adopt draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 without a vote.

13. Mr. BAAH (Ghana), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Ukraine), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, Mr. CORR (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, and Ms. LUO Xu (China) said that they fully endorsed the proposals put forward by the Acting Chairman of the Committee on Information in his statement. They therefore requested the Special Political Committee to adopt draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 without a vote.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Special Political Committee agreed to the proposals made by the Acting Chairman of the Committee on Information concerning financial reallocations, and to the request that the proposals in question should be fully reflected in the report of the Special Political Committee on the item.

15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Special Political Committee wished to adopt draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 without a vote.

17. Draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.5 and L.6 were adopted without a vote.

18. Mr. ALSAIDI (Yemen) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolutions just adopted on the understanding that the proposals made by the Acting Chairman of the Committee on Information would expedite the implementation of the recommendation of that Committee concerning the establishment of an information centre in San'a, Yemen.

19. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft decision on an increase in the membership of the Committee on Information set out in paragraph 111 of that Committee's report (A/46/21). By that decision the membership of the Committee on Information would be increased from 78 to 79 members and Burkina Faso would be appointed as a member. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Special Political Committee wished to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

20. The draft decision in paragraph 111 of the report of the Committee on Information (A/46/21) was adopted without a vote.

21. Mr. SERME (Burkina Faso) thanked the Special Political Committee for having recommended its appointment as a member of the Committee on Information, which could count on its active participation and cooperation.

AGENDA ITEM 73: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/46/65, 282, 440-445, 521 and 522; A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 and L.24-L.29)

22. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that the Special Political Committee's debate on the agenda item was still timely because events in the occupied territories would have a considerable impact on the welcome peace process that had just begun. One issue was the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (the fourth Geneva Convention). The burden of proof lay on an obligated State to show that in the actual situation a given commitment did not apply. The disclaimers by Israel had not convinced the world community, as evidenced by scores of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. By finally admitting that the Convention did apply and by living up to its responsibilities, Israel would send a powerful message of good will and a signal of its commitment to a resolution of the problem. The establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories was particularly counterproductive in the search for a fair and lasting solution. The recently revived idea of establishing an Israeli-Palestinian commission to determine the use of public lands in the occupied territories until the specifics of the proposed transition were agreed upon would be a first step advantageous to both sides.

23. Yet the fourth Geneva Convention was not the only source of Israel's legal obligations. In time of peace a nation must answer also to the more comprehensive obligations imposed by the customary law guaranteeing human rights, which prohibited murder, torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, prolonged arbitrary detention, or a consistent pattern of gross violations of recognized human rights. Thus, the protection of Palestinians in the occupied territories was an issue of continuing relevance. One way of protecting them would be as proposed in Security Council resolution 681 (1990), paragraph 6, to convene a meeting of the parties to the fourth Geneva Convention. The Special Political Committee as well should consider ways of making its deliberations more meaningful and more relevant and finding a new approach that could serve the twin objectives of a more effective United Nations involvement and the building of confidence among the parties in conflict.

24. Mr. MARTINEZ (Cuba), referring to the sufferings of the Palestinian people and other Arabs in the occupied territories and their indomitable will to struggle for their legitimate rights, said that Cuba joined the universal call for a just solution that would guarantee the rights of all the Arab peoples in the region, and ensure both regional and world peace. Cuba stood ready to further all efforts aimed at a just and lasting solution and to help the Palestinian people occupy its rightful place as a nation among other nations. Unfortunately, the fact remained that tension and violence had increased in the occupied territories. Israel's defiant and aggressive conduct was the main obstacle, and it was therefore incumbent upon all States

(Mr. Martinez, Cuba)

to send the clear message that Israel had no option but to put an end to illegal settlements, return the occupied territories, and guarantee strict observance of the rights of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples.

25. Mr. AMIN-MANSOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the further deterioration of the human rights situation in the occupied territories was clearly the result of the persistence of the Zionists in their occupation of Palestine, their military occupation and annexation of the adjacent territories, their imposition of difficult living conditions and their repressive policies. The constant immigration of Jews to Israel, particularly from the Soviet Union, coupled with the expansionist Israeli policy of illegal settlements in the occupied territories and the acts of aggression committed by Jewish settlers against Arab civilians, were a prime cause of the rising climate of fear and tension.

26. The right to freedom of expression had been curtailed by the closure of newspapers and news agencies, and the harassment of journalists. Freedom of education had been infringed as a result of numerous and extended school closures. The prolonged imposition of curfews and other restrictions on movement had affected all aspects of living conditions in the occupied territories, including worship, health, nutrition, agricultural activities and general economic and social welfare. The high rate of arrests and detentions and the ill-treatment of detainees were yet another aspect of the destructive situation. The reports before the Committee detailed countless other examples of violations of basic human rights. Neither the intifadah nor the Persian Gulf war justified any aggression against the oppressed and innocent people of Palestine. The popular uprising of the Palestinians was a natural reaction of a nation subjected to inhuman practices, a legitimate demonstration against the occupying Power and a cry to the world for restoration of inalienable rights. Humanitarian organizations were seeking to alleviate the sufferings of the Palestinians, but it was the responsibility of the entire international community to restore their rights to self-determination and the establishment of an independent State in the entire land of Palestine.

27. Mr. JAYA (Brunei Darussalam) said that the Israeli authorities continued to use harsh methods against Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories, thus violating the fourth Geneva Convention. His delegation was greatly concerned about the closure of schools and universities in the occupied territories and the repression and persecution of students and faculty members, as detailed in the report of the Special Committee (A/46/522). The persistent use of closure orders and the dramatic decline in the quality of education on offer were violations of the fundamental right to education. A failed education was a lifetime penalty for a child.

28. The Palestinians had also been denied their rights to economic freedom, public utilities and a sound infrastructure and, most important of all, they were denied the freedom to live and seek shelter in their homeland. That was in marked contrast to the Israeli policy of resettling Jewish citizens and

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei Darussalam)

immigrants in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. In view of the international move towards a comprehensive solution of the Palestinian question, the establishment of settlements should be halted as soon as possible.

29. His delegation reiterated its call to the Israeli authorities to comply with the relevant international conventions and resolutions. It hoped that the peace conference to be convened in Washington would move towards that goal and advance the prospects for a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

30. Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia) deplored Israel's refusal to allow the Special Committee access to the occupied territories as a shameful attempt to cover up the truth. In fact, the long list of repressive measures used by the Israeli authorities had been well catalogued and were unacceptable by any norms of human behaviour. The conclusion of the Special Committee's report (A/46/522, para. 441) was of great concern to his delegation. Furthermore, the cperations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) were increasingly subjected to harassment and interference by the Israeli authorities, in violation of UNRWA's privileges and immunities. The United Nations should condemn Israel for its continued transgressions of international law and persistent mistreatment of the Palestinian people, since the Organization's efforts to encourage respect for human rights would otherwise become an empty claim.

31. Malaysia also viewed with great concern the continued establishment of illegal Jewish settlements in the Palestinian and Arab occupied territories, particularly in the light of the indications in the Special Committee's report that the Israeli authorities would intensify the settlements policy. Not only were the new settlers participating in acts of violence and aggression against the civilian Palestinian population, even the few resources that the Palestinians had left, such as water, were now being diverted to the new settlements. Peace and the usurpation of other people's land were incompatible. Israel's policy and practices were particularly sad in the light of Jewish history and were having an adverse effect on its own youth and society.

32. Despite the brutal measures unleashed on them by the Israelis, the Palestinians continued, quite legitimately, to struggle for their right to a homeland. Since the beginning of the uprising, thousands of Palestinians had been killed, injured and detained. Given the vulnerability of the Palestinians, Malaysia urged the Security Council to implement its resolutions 673 (1990) and 681 (1990) in order to ensure the protection of Palestinian civilians.

33. Mr. AL-ZAYANI (Bahrain) said that the Special Committee report (A/46/522) provided important information regarding the deteriorating situation in the occupied Arab territories as far as human rights and fundamental freedoms were concerned. Israel's policy of annexation and widespread settlement and its repressive measures against Arab civilians had created appalling violence and tension. In addition, Israel had attempted to alter the national and demographic features of the occupied territories and to exploit their natural resources in violation of international conventions and relevant United Nations resolutions, which had deemed such policies to be a serious and illegal impediment to a just and comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem. The Special Committee's report contained numerous examples clearly illustrating Israel's expansionist settlement policy.

34. Furthermore, the Israeli Knesset had recently declared that the Syrian Arab Golan was non-negotiable, a move which constituted an illegitimate attempt to hinder the peace process begun in Madrid. It was also a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions which was intended to provoke the Arab participants in the peace conference. Israel continued to challenge and ignore such resolutions, as in the case of the Golan, for instance, where Security Council resolution 497 (1981) had declared Israeli-imposed laws, administration and control to be legally ineffective.

35. The Special Committee's report told of the countless repressive practices randomly carried out by Israel against Arab citizens of all ages in the occupied Arab territories. Moreover, Arabs did not have access to legal justice and received harsh sentencing in comparison with Israeli settlers charged with committing crimes against Arab civilians. They also suffered material hardship owing to the deteriorating economic, social and health conditions in the occupied territories, and were psychologically harassed and humiliated in their daily lives. The Palestinian people would continue to suffer as long as occupation and settlement continued, while human rights and fundamental freedoms were absent from the territories in question, the occupation of which was in itself a violation of such rights.

36. Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Ukraine) said that the ever-increasing length of the Special Committee's report was a tragic reflection of the human suffering in the occupied territories. The current report (A/46/522) indicated the recent deterioration in the situation, including the continued use of collective punishment. There were increasing restrictions on freedom of speech, movement and religion, particularly since the Gulf war. Education also continued to be under attack.

37. The Israeli authorities had stepped up their policy of annexation and settlement in the occupied territories. A significant proportion of the immigrants arriving in the occupied territories were from Ukraine. Their presence raised tension between them and their Jewish and Arab neighbours, and the immigrants often found it difficult to adapt to new conditions. His delegation did not appreciate the use being made for propaganda purposes of the spectre of "Ukrainian anti-Semitism". Just a few months previously,

(Mr. Shevchenko, Ukraine)

Ukraine had commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the tragic events at Babi Yar in Kiev, and the Ukrainian legislature and Ukrainian leaders had roundly condemned anti-Semitism. Ukraine had managed to maintain the peace among the various peoples in its territories. At the same time, there was an armed struggle under way between Arabs and Jews in the occupied territories.

38. Nevertheless, the Madrid conference on the Middle East and forthcoming bilateral talks in the United States gave grounds for optimism. The statement by the Prime Minister of Israel that the occupied territories might be the subject of negotiations was also encouraging.

39. As a member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Ukraine wished to draw particular attention to the conclusions of the report of that body (A/46/35).

40. The heavy concentration of arms in the Middle East made it a particularly volatile region, and a positive and rapid resolution of the issue was therefore indispensable. A unique window of opportunity had opened and it would be unforgivable to let it pass.

41. Mr. PODTSEROB (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's position on the issue before the Committee was well known and remained unchanged. At the same time, it believed that real prospects now existed for a fair and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East and that the chance to achieve it should not be lost. The best possibility of success lay in the adoption by all parties to the negotiating process of an attitude of flexibility and willingness to deal with each other. His delegation hoped that eventually that confidence-building approach would triumph and that the Special Committee would be able to report to the General Assembly that its mandate had been carried out fully.

42. The Soviet Union, which had co-chaired the conference in Madrid, believed that it was inappropriate at the current juncture for the United Nations to adopt resolutions dealing directly with the substance of the issues under discussion there. Its role at present was to encourage the negotiations and to help create the conditions which would make progress possible. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain in the votes on the draft resolutions. At the same time, it agreed that the Special Committee should continue its work on the question.

43. It had often been noted that the Arab-Israeli conflict had gone on for decades. It should also be pointed out, however, that the two peoples had lived together in peace for centuries. His delegation hoped that the time was not far off when Jews and Arabs would not only live together again in peace but would live together as good neighbours and collaborators, making their contributions to world civilization.

44. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1, L.27, L.28 and L.29 on behalf of their sponsors, said that the question of Palestine was one of the greatest tragedies of modern times and Bangladesh's position on it was consistent and categorical. Its support for the Palestinian cause was unwavering.

45. The report of the Special Committee and the statement by its Chairman had painted a grim picture of the human rights situation of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. Israeli authorities continued to violate the fundamental human rights of the Palestinian and Arab people and to pursue a policy of establishing new settlements. Those policies were clear violations of the fourth Geneva Convention and various Security Council resolutions.

46. His delegation hoped the Madrid conference would lead to a just and lasting solution of the problem and that the peace process would take into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. A comprehensive, just and durable solution to the conflict could not be achieved unless Israel withdrew from Palestine, including Jerusalem and Arab territories occupied since 1967.

47. The draft resolutions under discussion recalled the elements of the similar resolutions adopted in 1990 and also reflected some of the key developments that had taken place subsequently. Since the resolutions did not differ greatly from those adopted at the previous session of the General Assembly, the sponsors hoped that they would be adopted with broad support.

48. Mr. FAZI-I-MAHMOOD (Pakistan) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.24, L.25 and L.26 and expressed the hope that they would receive the widest possible support.

49. Mr. POPESCU (Romania), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, expressed his delegation's concern for the Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories and its full support for any constructive way of ending of the situation now prevailing in the area. The convening of the Peace Conference in Madrid had given an impetus for such action. For the first time, Israelis and Arabs had come together at the same table in an attempt to bridge their differences without making inflammatory statements. All those involved were to be commended for their new realistic approach; his delegation hoped that through flexibility and compromise a lasting peace would eventually be achieved in the Middle East. Romania had also hoped that the confidence-building climate would prevail in reformulating the resolution adopted at the General Assembly's forty-fifth session, which was now before the Committee as draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1. Unfortunately, there had been no change in its language or in that of the other draft resolutions. That was no way to encourage and support a genuine dialogue at the negotiating table, and Romania would therefore vote against draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1. In view of the humanitarian aspects of the other draft resolutions, his delegation would vote in favour of them, on the clear understanding that the language again lacked the necessary reflection of the new situation created in the area.

50. Mrs. TAHIR-KHELI (United States of America) said that the United States had a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintained a constant dialogue with the Government of Israel on the subject. Where it disagreed with Israeli policies it made its views known to the Government of Israel and would continue to do so.

51. Her delegation would not support resolutions which made no practical contribution to safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories or to the search for a just and lasting peace in the region. The one-sided and inflammatory language of the draft resolutions before the Committee served only to divide the parties further and make a negotiated settlement more difficult to achieve. Her delegation called again upon the members of the Committee to desist from outmoded rhetoric and adopt the more constructive approach which would be particularly needed in the period ahead.

52. Her delegation objected strongly to draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1, which contained a sweeping condemnation of a long list of unsubstantiated Israeli practices. Nor could it support language urging the Security Council to consider measures to secure "international protection" for the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied Territories, which was impractical and did not address the underlying problems.

53. Her delegation supported the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. It therefore requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.24, which it supported. It would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because the resolution's strident rhetoric did nothing to resolve the problems it sought to address.

54. Further Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories was an obstacle to peace. However, the United States would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.25, as it was unproductive to debate over the legalities of the issue and thus divert attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations.

55. The United States could not support draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.26 because that text did not address legitimate security problems as they existed in the occupied territories. The United States remained opposed to the practice of administrative detention.

56. Her delegation had stated repeatedly that Israel's deportation of Palestinian residents in the occupied territories was inconsistent with the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention. It was nevertheless obligated to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.27 because the resolution's harsh polemical tone offered no realistic solution.

(Mrs. Tahir-Kheli, United States)

57. Her delegation's position remained that the Golan was occupied Syrian territory and that the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention therefore applied in it. The United States opposed any unilateral action to alter the status of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967 because that was an issue which must be resolved through negotiations in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). In the case of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.28, again, its harsh and unbalanced rhetoric mandated the abstention of the United States.

58. In spite of strong concerns over the current situation with respect to education in the occupied territories, her delegation objected to draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.29 because sweeping condemnation of Israeli policies and practices was unjustified and counterproductive.

59. Lastly, the United States objected to references to Jerusalem in phrases such as "occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967,". Those phrases described the territories demographically, were limited to territories occupied in 1967, and should not prejudge their status, which could only be resolved through negotiations. The United States was convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided, but that its final status should be decided through negotiations.

60. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Cyprus, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

61. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 53 votes to 35, with 32 abstentions.

62. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, Romania, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain*, Sweden, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

63. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 75 votes to 4, with 43 abstentions.

64. Mr. URTASUN (Spain) said that his delegation had mistakenly abstained in the vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1, but had intended to vote against it.

---

* See para. 64 below.

65. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.24.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

66. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.24 was adopted by 120 votes to 1.

67. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.24 as a whole.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi,

Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

68. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.24 as a whole was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

69. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.25.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

70. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.25 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

71. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.26.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

72. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.26 was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

73. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.27.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao

People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

74. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.27 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

75. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.29.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

76. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.28 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

77. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.29.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Dominica, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

78. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.29 was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the vote to do so.

80. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all but one of the draft resolutions just adopted, in line with Austria's rejection of Israeli practices in the occupied territories. It had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole, however, because of unacceptable formulations such as the legal qualification of certain acts in paragraph 6, which could only be made by a competent judicial authority.

81. Mr. von BARTHELD (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that they had voted in favour of all but one of the draft resolutions just adopted, because of the importance they attached to matters affecting the rights of the population of the occupied Arab territories, and guided by their respect for international law, notably the principles of the inadmissibility of the acquisition and occupation of territory by force and the need to comply fully with the fourth Geneva Convention. The Twelve had, however, abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 because of the wording of some of its paragraphs that was contrary to the prevailing positive atmosphere of dialogue between the parties in the conflict.

82. They also recalled that they had not supported all the resolutions referred to in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.27, or in some of the other draft resolutions.

83. Mr. WIDE (Sweden) said that his delegation had voted in favour of six of the seven draft resolutions concerning Israeli practices but had unfortunately had to abstain on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole and to vote against paragraph 6 of that draft resolution. While endorsing the substance of the draft resolution, and being gravely concerned about many of the policies and practices described in paragraphs 8 and 9, Sweden was not convinced that all the assertions in those paragraphs were justified by proven facts. It also felt that paragraphs 12 and 13 went beyond the competence of the General Assembly.

84. In addition, his delegation pointed out that its support for draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.28 in no way altered Sweden's opposition to resolution ES-9/1, which was recalled in the preamble and against which Sweden had voted in 1982.

85. Ms. PIATELLI (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.28, while not concurring with the statement in the seventh preambular paragraph that all territories occupied by Israel must be returned. That issue, which could only be solved by negotiation between the parties concerned, under the terms of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), should not be prejudged.

86. Canada had abstained on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.29 despite its concern over Israeli practices, because paragraph 3 did not reflect the welcome steps taken by Israel to reopen a number of educational institutions.

87. Ms. BIRD (Australia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of all except draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1. However, had there been separate votes on paragraph 1 of draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.27 and L.28, Australia would have abstained, since they referred to certain General Assembly resolutions which it had not supported.

(Ms. Bird, Australia)

88. It was Australia's understanding that the references to the occupied territories in the texts just adopted were references only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. That position applied also to any such references in resolutions considered under other agenda items.

89. Australia hoped that the following year the Committee could minimize duplication and repetition in the resolutions adopted under the item under discussion and ensure that the texts fully reflected current circumstances.

90. Mr. AMIN-MANSOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, despite certain reservations. Iran could not accept any term that conveyed implicit or explicit recognition of the Israeli regime.

91. Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.23/Rev.1 because it did not approve of the language used, which was not conducive to a peaceful settlement of the Middle East question. Its negative vote, however, should not be interpreted as a change in Uruguay's unwavering support for the fourth Geneva Convention, which was fully applicable to the occupied territories.

92. Uruguay had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.24, L.25, L.27, L.28 and L.29 because it supported their objectives. There, too, however, it had strong reservations about the wording, which was not likely to further a solution and which reflected circumstances that had been overtaken by events.

93. Ms. HAUG (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of most of the draft resolutions just adopted, despite its reservations to some of the formulations used, especially in draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.26, L.27, L.28 and L.29.

94. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine) thanked all countries that had voted in favour of the draft resolutions just adopted. The Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization considered that such overwhelming support reflected the enormous support for their just struggle to end the Israeli occupation and regain their national rights.

95. What most divided the parties to the conflict was not the wording of the draft resolutions but the actual Israeli policies and practices that led the Committee to adopt such resolutions. The resolutions would change when the reality on the ground changed. Israel, which was so sensitive to the language of resolutions, should be more sensitive to the daily sufferings of the Palestinian people under its brutal occupation. He called upon Israel to stop its violence and State terrorism against them.

PROGRAMME BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

96. The CHAIRMAN informed members that the usual Secretariat summary of the programme budget implications of draft resolutions adopted by the Committee, pursuant to rule 154 of the rules of procedure, would not be issued since the Committee had already received the two applicable statements of programme budget implications: one contained in document A/SPC/46/L.7 in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6 under agenda item 75; and the other in document A/SPC/46/L.10 and Add.1 in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.9 under agenda item 74.

97. He also recalled that he had transmitted information provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division, in connection with draft resolutions under items 71 and 72, to the Committee at the 20th and 25th meetings.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

98. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the forty-sixth session.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.